UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,160	01/25/2005	John Lillington	550-609	9546
	7590 08/16/2007 NDERHYE, PC		EXAMINER	
901 NORTH G	LEBE ROAD, 11TH FI	OOR	SINGH, HIRDEPAL	
ARLINGTON,	VA 22203		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			2611	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		·	08/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

			E//		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/520,160	LILLINGTON ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Hirdepal Singh	2611			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addres	s		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION IN 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS froute, cause the application to become ABANDO	ON. It timely filed om the mailing date of this commur NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	·		
Status		,			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04.	January 2005.				
	is action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	ance except for formal matters, p		rits is		
Disposition of Claims		•			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdress 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10)☑ The drawing(s) filed on <u>04 January 2005</u> is/are: a)☑ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	= : :	• •	121(4)		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•				
a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prinapplication from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applica ority documents have been recei au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No ived in this National Stag	l e		
Attachment(s)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summa				
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/04/05. 	Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 2611

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the filing date of January 25, 2005. Claims 1-10 are pending and have been considered below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1, 2 and 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lillington (US 2001/0022811).

Regarding claim 1:

Apparatus for frequency content separating an input signal (abstract), said apparatus comprising:

a plurality of frequency separating stages (abstract), each frequency separating stage including at least one complex frequency shifting converter operable to receive a complex input signal representing an input bandwidth extending from -Fs/2 to +Fs/2 (figure 2) and to output a first frequency shifted complex output signal representing an upper portion of said input bandwidth and a second frequency

Art Unit: 2611

shifted complex output signal representing a lower portion of said input bandwidth (filter bank output represents the upper and lower portion of input bandwidth in figure 2; paragraphs 0006 and 0033), wherein

at least one complex frequency shifting converter in at least one of said plurality of frequency separating stages is a tuned complex frequency shifting converter (figures 3 and 4) having a frequency shifting characteristic operable to output a frequency shifted complex output signal representing a portion of said input bandwidth centered other than at -Fs/4 or +Fs/4 (filter bank A output in figure 2).

Regarding claim 2:

Lillington discloses all of the subject matter as described above and further discloses frequency shifting converter has a frequency shifting characteristic operable to output a frequency shifted complex output signal representing a portion of said input bandwidth having an output bandwidth as Fs/2 (as shown in figure 2) except for specifically showing a bandwidth between Fs/2 and 3Fs/4. However, this is interpreted as being an output bandwidth that could be either Fs/2 or up to 3Fs/4 (Applicant has not explained this limitation in detail except for just making a statement "having an output bandwidth between Fs/2 and 3Fs/4" on page 2 lines 20-21).

Regarding claim 4:

Lillington discloses all of the subject matter as described above and further discloses between frequency separating stages frequency shifted complex output

Art Unit: 2611

signals are decimated and interleaved (paragraphs 0035 and 0038) for subsequent processing.

Regarding claim 5:

Lillington discloses all of the subject matter as described above and further discloses tuned frequency shifting complex converter includes a local oscillator (paragraphs 0013 and 0043) operable to generate one or more time varying coefficient signals by which sample values forming said input signal are multiplied as part of frequency separation.

Regarding claim 6:

Lillington discloses all of the subject matter as described above and further discloses local oscillator is operable to generate a selectable one of a plurality of different streams of time varying coefficient signals (paragraphs 0051 and 0064) each corresponding to a different local oscillator frequency and operable to separate a different portion of said input bandwidth.

Regarding claim 7:

Lillington discloses all of the subject matter as described above and further discloses tuned frequency shifting complex converter is one of, a tuned complex upconverter, and a tuned complex down-converter (paragraph 0015).

Art Unit: 2611

Regarding claim 8:

Lillington discloses all of the subject matter as described above and further discloses one or more of said plurality of frequency separating stages includes a complex up-converter and a complex down-converter pair (paragraph 0017) that together are operable to separate a complex input signal into an upper frequency portion and a lower frequency portion being substantially contiguous and of equal size.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lillington (US 2001/0022811) in view of Garceran et al. (US 6,944,238).

Regarding claim 3:

Lillington discloses all of the subject matter as described above except for specifically teaching plurality of frequency separating stages are operable to generate a plurality of output signals each bearing one or more target carrier signals, said plurality of output signals respectively representing portions of said input bandwidth which at least one of differ in size and are non-contiguous.

Art Unit: 2611

However, Garceran et al in the same field of endeavor teaches a system and method for frequency conversion (column 6, lines 8-12) where output signals respectively representing portions of said input bandwidth which at least one of differ in size (figures 1, 3 and 4) and are non-contiguous (column 4, lines 30-36).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the output bandwidth of the frequency conversion stages in the form of non contiguous stages as it is advantageous to have bandwidths of different sizes and not contiguous in some real life applications.

5. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lillington (US 2001/0022811) in view of Carr et al. (US 7,2236,212)...

Regarding claim 10:

Lillington discloses all of the subject matter as described above and further discloses;

determining a number of frequency separating stages required (paragraph 0008) to separate all target signals;

generating local oscillator coefficient values (paragraph 0013) for each frequency separating stage;

selecting a band shaping filter (figure 14) to be applied to each target signal; generating fine-tuning local oscillator coefficient values for any fine tuning elements within final frequency separating stages(paragraph 0013).

Art Unit: 2611

Lillington doesn't specifically teaching determining whether two target signals require extracting from any final frequency separating stage, and if so providing two fine tuning elements (column 28, lines 5-15) for those final frequency separating stages.

However, Carr et al. in the same filed of endeavor teaches that two target signals require extracting from any final frequency separating stage, and if so providing two fine tuning elements (column 28, lines 5-15) for those final frequency separating stages.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement passing the plurality of output signal through fine tuning stages in order to get the required target signals as fine tuning allows more accurate tuning regardless of selected frequency and variation in process, conditions and supply voltage etc. and permits high speed channel changes, good phase changing values with high comparison frequencies.

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lillington (US 2001/0022811) in view of Garceran et al. (US 6,944,238) as applied to claim 3 above and further in view of Carr et al. (US 7,2236,212).

Regarding claim 9:

Lillington discloses all of the subject matter as described above except for specifically teaching plurality of output signals are passed through respective fine tuning stages that serve to extract said target carrier signals.

Art Unit: 2611

However, Carr et al. in the same filed of endeavor teaches that output signal passed through fine tuning stages to extract carrier signal (column 15, lines 57-62).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement passing the plurality of output signal through fine tuning stages in order to get the advantage of fine tuning as it permits high speed channel changes, good phase changing values with high comparison frequencies. It also allows more accurate tuning regardless of selected frequency and variation in process, conditions and supply voltage.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hirdepal Singh whose telephone number is 571-270-1688. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (Alternate Friday Off)8:00AM-5:00PMEST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shuwang Liu can be reached on 571-272-3036. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2611

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HS August 8, 2007 Shuwang Liu SPE - 2611

She way Tim

SHUWANG LIU SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER